

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for carefully considering this application and for courtesies extended during the Examiner Interview conducted on October 15, 2007.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-18 were pending in this application. By way of this reply, new claims 19-24 have been added. Thus, claims 1-24 are currently pending. Claims 1 and 8-10 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1 and 8-10.

Claim Amendments

New dependent claims 19-24 has been added by this reply. Support for new dependent claims 11-18 may be found, for example, in paragraph [0063] of the Published Specification. No new matter has been added by any of the new claims.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C § 103**Claims 1-4, 6-10**

Claims 1-4 and 6-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,754,725 ("Wright")¹ in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0178316 ("Schmisseur"). For the reasons set forth below, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

One or more embodiments of the claimed invention are directed to a main device (*e.g.*, USB host) and an auxiliary device (*e.g.*, USB device), such that the auxiliary device is configured to hide functionalities which the main device is not arranged to handle. For example, a USB host may comprise various applications. In order to run, the various applications may require one or several services. The USB device may comprise various services, in particular, those which are needed by the applications of the USB host in the aforementioned example. In fact, the USB device may comprise additional services for which the USB host is not arranged to handle (*i.e.*, does not have applications which necessitate the additional services or the USB host lacks user privileges for the additional services). As a result, the USB device will hide functionalities which the USB host is not arranged to handle. Advantageously, the claimed invention may allow auxiliary devices (*e.g.*, USB devices) to be mass produced, such that each auxiliary device is configured to effect the same standard set of functionalities, thereby reducing cost. *See* Published Specification, pars. [0005]-[0006], [0018], [0063].

Accordingly, independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “wherein the method further comprises an enumeration step in which the auxiliary device ... hides from the main device at least those of its functionalities for which the main device is not arranged to handle.” Emphasis added. Independent claims 8, 9, and 10 include similar limitations. The aforementioned limitation requires that the auxiliary device enumerate its (*i.e.*, the auxiliary device’s) functionalities to the main device, where the only the functionalities the main device is able to handle are enumerated (*i.e.*, listed). (*See e.g.*, Published Application, [0047]).

¹ In the Office Action mailed on July 27, 2007, the Examiner cited U.S. Patent No. 6,754,725 to Write, however, U.S. Patent No. 6,754,725 is actually credited to Wright.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the cited references must teach or suggest all the limitations of the claims. *See MPEP § 2143.* The Examiner admits that Wright fails to disclose “a second enumeration [that] hides from the main device at least those of its functionalities for which the main device is not arranged to handle.” *See Office Action mailed July 27, 2007, p. 3.* Rather, the Examiner relies on Schmisser to teach that which Wright lacks.

The Applicants respectfully assert that Schmisser fails to teach or suggest that which Wright lacks. Specifically, because a data bus may communicate with multiple device functions associated with a peripheral device, Schmisser is directed to controlling access to multiple device functions on the peripheral device from the data bus. *See Schmisser, pars. [0005] and [0018].* Turning to Figure 1 of Schmisser, a peripheral device 16 includes at least two device functions which may be adapted to communicate through respective I/O channels 20 and 22. *See Schmisser, par. [0024].* Because the peripheral device includes multiple device functions, the I/O processor may initiate a bus transaction to conceal one or more device functions of the peripheral device from the host processing system. *See Schmisser, par. [0025].* The concealing of device functions performed by the I/O processor is aimed at controlling access to the multiple device functions by the host processing system. Schmisser is silent with respect to hiding particular functionalities in an auxiliary device because a host processing system is not arranged to handle the particular functionalities. The Applicants respectfully assert that controlling access to various device functions in order to limit access to multiple device functions cannot be equated with hiding functionalities that the main device is not arranged to handle, as required by the claimed invention.

In view of the above, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness using Wright and Schmisser. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 8, 9, and 10 are

patentable over Wright and Schmisser. Dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 8, 9, and 10. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 5

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Wright in view of Schmisser, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,738,834 ("Williams"). To the extent that this rejection applies to independent claim 1, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 5 depends from independent claim 1. As discussed previously, Wright and Schmisser, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of independent claim 1. Further, Williams fails to teach or suggest that which Wright and Schmisser lack as evidenced by the fact that Williams is only relied upon to teach "simulating a disconnect and reconnect of the auxiliary device," *See* Office Action mailed July 27, 2007, p. 7. In view of the above, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness using Wright, Schmisser, and Williams. Accordingly, independent claim 1 and dependent claim 5 are patentable over Wright, Schmisser, and Williams. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 11-18

Claims 12, 14, 16, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Wright in view of Schmisser as applied to claims 11, 13, 15, and 17, and further in view of

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0147912 (“Shmueli”). To the extent that this rejection applies to independent claims 1, 8, 9, and 10, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 11-18 depend from independent claims 1, 8, 9, and 10. As discussed previously, Wright and Schmisser, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of independent claims 1, 8, 9, and 10. Further, Shmueli does not teach or suggest that which Wright and Schmisser lack as evidenced by the fact that Shmueli is only relied upon to teach “at least one of the services is required to run an application on the main device,” *See* Office Action mailed July 27, 2007, p. 8. In view of the above, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness using Wright, Schmisser, and Shmueli. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 8, 9, and 10 and dependent claims 11-18 are patentable over Wright, Schmisser, and Shmueli. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claims

New claims 19-24 depend directly from independent claims 1, 8, or 10. New claims 19-20 depend directly from independent claim 1. New claims 21-22 depend directly from independent claim 8. New claims 23-24 depend directly from independent claim 10. Accordingly, dependent claims 19-24 are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as independent claims 1, 8, and 10.

Further, none of cited prior art, whether considered separately or in combination, teaches or suggests either: (i) the main device enumerating to the auxiliary device the functionalities of the auxiliary device for which the main device is arranged to handle after the first enumeration and prior to the second enumeration; or (ii) the main device enumerating to the auxiliary device the

functionalities of the auxiliary device for which the main device is not arranged to handle after the first enumeration and prior to the second enumeration.

The aforementioned limitations require that the main device list which functionalities is it is (or is not) arranged to handle. Further, this enumeration from the main device must occur between the first enumeration of the auxiliary device and the second enumeration of the auxiliary device. Based on the above discussion of the prior art, none of the cited prior art, whether considered separately or in combination, teaches or suggests the limitations found in new dependent claims 19-24. Accordingly, favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowability is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 09669/043001).

Dated: October 25, 2007

Respectfully submitted,


By _____
Jonathan E. Osha
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)